

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 Andreea Melissa Olteanu,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 Louis Schneider, et al.,

10 Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-02006-RFB-DJA

Order

11 Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 Plaintiff is proceeding in this action *pro se* and *in forma*
12 *pauperis*. On June 20, 2024, the Court ordered Plaintiff to file an amended complaint in
13 compliance with the Court's prior screening order (ECF No. 7) on or before July 18, 2024. (ECF
14 No. 15). Plaintiff filed a document titled "Amended Complaint" on July 23, 2024.¹ (ECF No.
15 16).

16 However, the document that Plaintiff filed as an "Amended Complaint" is not an amended
17 pleading, but seeks an extension of time to file her amended complaint. (*Id.*). The Court thus
18 liberally construes Plaintiff's filing as a motion for extension of time and grants it. The Court
19 makes no findings one way or the other on the arguments that Plaintiff includes in her motion.
20 But it finds that her *pro se* status constitutes good cause and excusable neglect to extend the
21 deadline and does so on that ground only. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b).

22
23
24
25
26
27
28 ¹ One of the documents Plaintiff filed is dated July 18, 2024. (ECF No. 16 at 4). But the Court's
records show that the documents were both filed and entered on July 23, 2024.

1 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff shall have until **October 28, 2024** to file
2 an amended complaint in compliance with the Court's prior screening order (ECF No. 7).

3 **Failure to timely comply with this order will result in the recommended dismissal of this**
4 **case.** The Clerk of Court is kindly directed to send Plaintiff a copy of this order.

5
6 DATED: September 27, 2024



DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE